

REMARKS

I. Status

The Office Action indicates claims 24-65 to be pending in this application. With this response, claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 24-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by El-Rafie (U.S. Patent No. 6,968,394).

Claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65 are independent.

II. Amendment of Independent Claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65

With this response, Applicants amend independent claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... obtaining one or more measurement values
corresponding to the monitoring of the interaction network;
[and]

selecting data, wherein selection is based upon one or more
of the measurement values corresponding to the monitoring
of the interaction network ...”

as set forth in each of claims 24, 44, and 64 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As another example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein one or more measurement values corresponding
to the monitoring of the interaction network are obtained,
and

wherein selection of the data is based upon one or more of the measurement values corresponding to the monitoring of the interaction network”

as set forth in each of claims 35, 55, and 65 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully observe, for example, that cited column 19 lines 5-37 of El-Rafie instead merely discuss selectively storing content based on the site from which the content originates and/or the content itself:

“[e]ach of the individual ISPs may also selectively store content based on the site from which the content originates and/or based on the contents itself. For example, the multicast filter may read data and web pages as they are being broadcast from the NOC 4 and received in each of the ISPs and/or corporate users and/or terminal devices 2. The multicast filter may screen for certain types of web pages and/or other content so that a selective cache of specific search enabled content is stored locally”
(see El-Rafie col. 19 ln. 29-37; emphasis added).

As another example, cited column 30 lines 18-26 of El-Rafie instead merely discuss roaming functionality IP address assignment :

“5. The asymmetric satellite based terminal device of claim 4, wherein the terminal device is assigned an IP address from the range of IP addresses assigned to the NOC based on a token.

6. The asymmetric satellite based terminal device of claim 5, wherein the token is in communication with the terminal device and is selected from the group consisting of an access card, a Smartcard, and a data key.

7. The asymmetric satellite based terminal device of claim 5, wherein the token is entered into the terminal device by a user and is selected from the group consisting of an id value, a password, an id value and a password, an encrypted ID, and an encrypted ID and a password”
(see El-Rafie col. 30 ln. 13-25; emphasis added)

“FIG. 15 provides an overview of a Roaming function which may be employed in embodiments asymmetric Internet system. In a roaming system, an Internet service providers,

in each of a plurality of countries, may be assigned a different IP address within a particular range of IP addresses known as an roaming IP range”
(see El-Rafie col. 28 ln. 33-38; emphasis added).

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24, 35, 44, 55, 64, and 65 at least as amended herewith, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

III. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

(Continued on next page)

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4041.

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Dated: October 31, 2007

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)